

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
WESTERN DIVISION**

WILLIAM L. FAMBROUGH,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 4:19-cv-0398-DGK
)	
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

This lawsuit arises from Defendant Uber Technologies, Inc.’s (“Uber”) deactivation of *pro se* Plaintiff William L. Fambrough’s driving account, which resulted in his no longer being able to drive for Uber.

Now before the Court is Plaintiff’s Notice of Voluntary Dismissal (Doc. 16), brought pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(i),¹ and Plaintiff’s subsequent “Motion to Quash” (Doc. 17) this notice after Plaintiff apparently changed his mind about wanting to dismiss his case.

Because Plaintiff dismissed his case under Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(i), the dismissal was effective at the time it was filed. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A)(i). This dismissal was not contingent on the Court approving or accepting it, so the case has already been dismissed without prejudice.

The motion to quash (Doc. 17) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: September 6, 2019

/s/ Greg Kays
GREG KAYS, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

¹ The Notice states it is brought pursuant to Rule “41(a)(i).” There is no Rule 41(a)(i). Plaintiff means Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(i).